

)	
In the Matter of)	
)	
MCI Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a)	
Verizon Business Services,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	File No. EB-08-MD-004
)	
Embarq Florida, Inc., United Telephone)	
Company of Indiana, Inc., United Telephone)	
Company of Eastern Kansas, United Telephone)	
Company of Kansas, United Telephone)	
Company of South Central Kansas, United)	
Telephone Company of Southeast Kansas,)	
Embarq Minnesota, Inc., Embarq Missouri,)	
Inc., United Telephone Company of the West,)	
United Telephone Company of New Jersey,)	
Inc., Central Telephone Company – Nevada,)	
Carolina Telephone and Telegraph LLC,)	
Central Telephone Company – North Carolina,)	
The United Telephone Company of)	
Pennsylvania LLC, United Telephone)	
Company of the Carolinas LLC, United)	
Telephone Company of Ohio, United)	
Telephone Company of the Northwest, United)	
Telephone Southeast LLC, Central Telephone)	
Company of Texas, United Telephone)	
Company of Texas, Inc., and Central)	
Telephone Company of Virginia,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Adopted: December 12, 2008

Released: December 12, 2008

By the Chief, Market Disputes Resolution Division, Enforcement Bureau:

1. On July 25, 2008, MCI Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a Verizon Business Services (“Verizon”) filed a formal complaint¹ against the above-named defendants (the “Embarq Companies”) pursuant to section 208 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the “Act”). In the Complaint, Verizon alleges that the Embarq Companies violated sections 201 and 203 of the Act and the

¹ Formal Complaint of Verizon, File No. EB-08-MD-004 (filed July 25, 2008) (“Complaint”).

Commission's "benchmark rules."²

2. On December 11, 2008, Verizon moved to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice.³ In its Motion, Verizon stated that it had settled its dispute with the Embarq Companies and that the Embarq Companies consented to the Motion.

3. We are satisfied that dismissing the Complaint with prejudice will serve the public interest by promoting the private resolution of disputes and by eliminating the need for further litigation and the expenditure of further time and resources of the parties and this Commission.

4. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), and 208 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), and 208, sections 1.720-1.736 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.720-1.736, and the authority delegated in sections 0.111, 0.311, of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.111, 0.311, that the Motion is GRANTED and the Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Alexander P. Starr
Chief, Market Disputes Resolution Division
Enforcement Bureau

² 47 U.S.C. §§ 201, 203; 47 C.F.R. § 61.26.

³ Letter from Rashann R. Duvall, counsel to Verizon, to Alexander P. Starr, File No. EB-08-MD-004 (filed Dec. 11, 2008) ("Motion").